Reply to Office Action mailed February 21, 2008

## REMARKS

Claims 1 to 7, 9 to 12, 14 to 23 and 27 to 34 are pending.

Former independent claim 1, 14 and 27 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of US Patent No. 5,501,655 to Rolt et al (hereinafter "Rolt") and US Patent No. 4,836,191 to Noske et al (hereinafter "Noske"). Claim 28 has been similarly rejected in view of Rolt, Noske and US Patent No. 5,549,638 to Burdette (hereinafter "Burdette").

Former claims 1, 14, 27 and 28 have been amended to clarify the structure of the jig assembly that support the ultrasonic probes. Specifically, as claimed, multiple collars are coaxially mounted about an axis defined by a shaft. Independent rotation of the collars about the shaft axis allows con-focal focusing of the ultrasonic probes, while positioning the probe to sight the con-focal region on the subject tissue (as now claimed in claims 1, 14, and 27). The jig assembly may thus be moved while the ultrasonic probes remain stationary (and focused) on the jig assembly (as explicitly claimed in claims 32 and 33). Moreover, the relative positioning of the collars about the axis allows the probes to surround a generally half hemispherical volume, well suited for breast treatment (vis. paragraph [0035] of the application). An identification probe may further be mounted to the support used to carry the probes (as in claims 4 and 28). A jig assembly so structured allows for flexible and precise con-focal focusing of multiple probes for ultrasonic cancer treatment. This structure and its benefits are simply not disclosed or suggested by Rolt, Noske or Burdette, either alone or in combination.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 14, 27 and 28 and allowance of these claims and claims 2-12, 15-23, dependent thereon is therefore requested.

New dependent claims 29-33 are presented for consideration by the Examiner. Support for these claims may be found in paragraphs [0034]-[0041] and FIGS. 2A, 2B, 3 and 4 of the application. These claims too, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Appl. No. 10/501,819 Amdt. dated August 21, 2008 Reply to Office Action mailed February 21, 2008

No new matter has been added by this amendment.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and allowance of this application are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP

By /James E. Beyer/ James E. Beyer Registration No. 39,564

One Dayton Centre, One South Main Street, Suite 1300 Dayton, Ohio 45502

Tel: (937) 449-6400 Fax: (937) 449-6405

August 21, 2008 MZ/kew (93417-26)